3/21/69

Dear Ross,

Too bad they gave you such a rough time at the Archives. But, you did learn for yourself just how open with its information the government is, did you not?

The Miami papers were about like the others. You could not learn much from them.

Your questions about the trial are largely self-answering. Novel and Arcacha were not called as witnesses because they were protected against subpena. Unfortunately, those multitudinous leads in O in NO, to which I added more than you will ever known, in some cases, complete, packaged cases, were never followed. Right before the favorable Supreme Court decision, it looked like finally they'd get to work. They didn't. And in my opinion they did less well than was possible with the minimum to which they restricted themselves. They had a bad indictment. No one took the initiative to change it when they learned it was defective. This they have again duplicated with the Shaw perjury indictment. I guess they have a tendency toward self-destruction. But insistence on Oswald as a ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ conscious conspirator and refusal to use the "and others unknown" part of the indictment to cover "False Oswalds", as I told them, cost them the case. What I was told, that it would be too complicated for the jury, I did not believe.

Those clippings that are duplicates are still useful. The Hall story is but a small part of what he confessed to me when I turned him on in February 1968. The NYFree Press-Mark Lane story is raw plagiarism-distortion. That happened to and with me when I was in NO April 1968, there were no emissaries to Garrison, and Bobby had not promised to reinvestigate. Even the WTAM-TV show was mine that I'd shared for Mark to introduce his new book. This story is no reflection of what happened on that show, when he stole thism material, very irresponsibly. I was keeping silent in order to develop a profitable relationship with Bobby people. Mark ended that forever. You will find the full story in COUP D'ETAT. So, now you have a faint glimpse of another, and a real whore. Even those dubious pictures, which do look so much like the sketch, have no meaning because the entire story is a misrepresentation. I am satisfied Bradley is innocent of the charges against him, that Garrison's own friends booby-trapped him into this because Bradley is of the right. Broshears was another phoney. You will note that no such stories have appeared over the names of responsible people working in the field (Mark did take Broshears and Jaffe to N.O., where Broshears promptly made scendal after scendàà until they eased him out of town again.)

The Crispin Curiel Gonzalez story seems to be as in the clipping you sent. I have it also, in some detail, in COUP D'ETAT.

The truth is not always pleasant, Ross, but I give it to you as it is.

Best to you both and thanks,

Sincerely,

COPY